
APPENDIX C—COAL SUITABILITY REVIEW

Lands found acceptable in this resource management plan (RMP) will be available for further consideration for leasing and/or exchange; however, all lands determined suitable, unsuitable, or unacceptable for further consideration for leasing and/or exchange may be reviewed, and suitability determinations may be modified based on new data during activity planning efforts. Unsuitability criteria apply only to surface coal mining—not underground mining.

The lands with coal resource development potential in the Little Snake coal planning area are located in the Yampa and Dansforth Hills Coal Fields. The coal planning includes federal coal within the following townships:

Sixth Principal Meridian

T. 3 N., R. 85 W.

T. 3 N., R. 86 W.

T. 3 N., R. 90 W. - R. 95 W.

T. 4 N., R. 86 W. - R. 95 W.

T. 5 N., R. 85 W. - R. 93 W.

T. 6 N., R. 86 W. - R. 93 W.

T. 7 N., R. 87 W. - R. 94 W.

T. 8 N., R. 86 W. - R. 94 W.

T. 9 N., R. 86 W.

These townships comprise about 638,758 acres federal coal lands.

CRITERION 1—FEDERAL LANDS SYSTEMS

All federal lands included in the following land systems or categories would be considered unsuitable: National Park System, National Wildlife Refuge System, National System of Trails, National Wilderness Preservation System, National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, National Recreation Areas, lands acquired with money derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, national forests, and federal lands in incorporated cities, towns, and villages.

Analysis: The coal planning area does not contain the following land systems or categories: National Park System, National Wildlife Refuge System, National System of Trails, National Wilderness Preservation System, National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, National Recreation Areas, lands acquired with money derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, or national forests; therefore, these land systems or categories would not be affected.

Craig is the only incorporated city within the planning area that has federal coal lands within its city limits. Although Hayden is an incorporated town, no federal coal lands occur within its city limits. None of the other towns or villages within the planning area are incorporated; therefore, they are not considered under this criterion.

CRITERION 2—RIGHTS OF WAY AND EASEMENTS

Federal lands that are within rights of way (ROW) or easements or within surface leases for residential, commercial, industrial, or other public purposes would be considered unsuitable.

Exceptions:

A lease may be issued and mining operations may be approved in such areas if the surface management agency determines one of the following:

- All or certain types of coal development (e.g., underground mining) will not interfere with the purpose of the ROW or easement.
- The ROW or easement was granted for mining purposes.
- The ROW or easement was issued for a purpose for which it is not used.
- The parties involved in the ROW or easement agree, in writing, to leasing.
- It is impractical to exclude such areas because of the location of coal and method of mining, and such areas or uses can be protected through appropriate stipulations.

Results:

Approximately 4,753 acres of federal land within the coal planning area could fall under the unsuitability Criterion 2 because of the linear ROWs.

After application of exceptions 1, 4, and 5 to the linear ROWs, these areas are suitable with the stipulation that this lease is subject to all prior existing rights on these lands.

After application of exception 5 to the surface-type ROW and surface lease, these areas are suitable with the stipulation that this lease is subject to all prior existing rights on these lands.

CRITERION 3—BUFFER ZONES ALONG RIGHTS OF WAY AND ADJACENT TO COMMUNITIES AND BUILDINGS

Federal lands affected by Section 522(e) (4) and (5) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 would be considered unsuitable, including lands within 100 feet of the outside line of the ROW of a public road, within 100 feet of a cemetery, or within 300 feet of any public building, school, church, community, institutional building, public park, or occupied dwelling.

Exceptions:

A lease may be issued for lands—

- Used as mine access roads or haulage roads that join the ROW for a public road
- For which the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement has issued a permit to have public roads relocated
- For which, after public notice and opportunity for public hearing in the locality, a written finding is made by the authorized officer that the interests of the public and the landowners affected by mining within 100 feet of a public road will be protected
- For which owners of occupied dwellings have given written permission to mine within 300 feet of their buildings.

Results:

For analysis, the figure in Table C-3 was derived from 1989 data, assuming that the area of buffer zones along ROW increased proportionally with an increase in the area of ROW; however, because existing

data is lacking and dwellings are continually being built, this criterion and its exceptions will be applied at the activity planning stage for coal leasing.

CRITERION 4—WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS

Federal lands designated as wilderness study areas would be considered unsuitable for possible wilderness designation while under review by the Administration and Congress. For any federal land that is to be leased or mined before completion of the wilderness inventory by the surface management agency, the environmental assessment or impact statement on the lease sale or mine plan should consider whether the land possesses the characteristics of a wilderness study area. If the finding is affirmative, the land would be considered unsuitable unless issuance of noncompetitive coal leases and mining on leases is authorized under the Wilderness Act and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA).

Results:

The coal planning area has no lands designated as wilderness study areas or wilderness areas.

CRITERION 5—SCENIC AREAS

Scenic federal lands designated by visual resource management (VRM) analysis as Class 1 (an area of outstanding scenic quality or high visual sensitivity) but not currently on the National Register of Natural Landmarks would be considered unsuitable. A lease may be issued if the surface management agency determines surface coal mining operations will not significantly diminish or adversely affect the scenic quality of the designated area.

Results:

The coal planning area has no lands designated as Class 1 VRM areas.

CRITERION 6—LANDS USED FOR SCIENTIFIC STUDIES

Federal lands under permit by the surface management agency and used for scientific studies involving food or fiber production, natural resources, or technology demonstrations and experiments would be considered unsuitable for the duration of the study, demonstration, or experiment, except where mining could be conducted in a manner that enhances or does not jeopardize the purposes of the study, as determined by the surface management agency, or where the principal scientific user or agency gives written concurrence to all or certain methods of mining.

Results:

No such lands exist within the coal planning area.

CRITERION 7—HISTORIC LANDS AND SITES

All publicly owned places on federal lands that are included in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) would be considered unsuitable. This criterion applies to any areas the surface management agency determines necessary, after consultation with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and

the State Historic Preservation Officer, to protect the inherent values of the property that made it eligible for listing in the NRHP .

Results:

There are no publicly owned cultural or historical resources listed in the NRHP within the coal planning area. Existing cultural resource surveys cover only a small portion of the federal lands involved.

CRITERION 8—NATURAL AREAS

Federal lands designated as natural areas or as national natural landmarks would be considered unsuitable.

Results:

No such lands exist within the coal planning area.

CRITERION 9—FEDERALLY LISTED ENDANGERED SPECIES

Federally designated critical habitats for threatened or endangered plant and animal species and habitats for federally threatened or endangered species determined by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the surface management agency to be of essential value, and where the presence of threatened or endangered species has been scientifically documented, would be considered unsuitable.

Exception:

A lease may be issued and mining operations approved if, after consultation with USFWS, the USFWS determines the proposed activity is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the listed species and their critical habitats.

Results:

A 1/2-mile buffer zone on either side of a section on the Yampa River within the coal planning area is unsuitable because of bald eagle and Colorado pikeminnow habitats. Other data on occurrences of federally listed threatened or endangered species is insufficient; therefore, this criterion and its exceptions will be applied at the activity planning stage for coal leasing.

CRITERION 10—STATE-LISTED ENDANGERED SPECIES

Federal lands containing habitats determined critical or essential for plant or animal species and listed by a State pursuant to State law as endangered or threatened would be considered unsuitable.

Results:

No lands are unsuitable under this criterion.

CRITERION 11—RAPTORS

This criterion includes golden eagle nesting sites, roost and concentration areas, falcon cliff nesting sites, and migratory bird habitats.

Any golden eagle nest or site on federal lands that is determined active and an appropriate buffer zone of land around the nest site would be considered unsuitable. Consideration of habitat availability for prey species and of terrain would be included in the determination of buffer zones. Buffer zones would be determined in consultation with USFWS. In addition, golden eagle roost and concentration areas of federal lands used during migration and wintering would be considered unsuitable.

Federal lands containing a falcon (excluding kestrel) cliff nesting site with an active nest and a buffer zone of federal land around the nest site would be considered unsuitable. Consideration of availability of habitat for prey species and of terrain would be included in the determination of buffer zones. Buffer zones would be determined in consultation with USFWS.

Federal lands that are high-priority habitat for migratory bird species of high federal interest on a regional or national basis, as determined jointly by the surface management agency and USFWS, would be considered unsuitable. Ferruginous hawk is currently the only species in the area that is of federal interest. A 1/2-mile buffer zone is generally needed to protect ferruginous hawk from harassment by human activity.

Exception:

A lease may be issued if one of the following occurs:

- The lease can be conditioned in such a way, either in manner or period of operation, that raptors will not be disturbed during breeding season.
- The surface management agency, with the concurrence of USFWS, determines the nest(s) will be moved.
- Buffer zones may be decreased if the surface management agency determines the active raptor nests will not be adversely affected.

Results:

Because data on all raptor occurrences is lacking, this criterion and its exceptions will be applied at the activity planning stage for coal leasing.

CRITERION 12—STATE RESIDENT FISH AND WILDLIFE

Federal lands, which the surface management agency and the State jointly agree are fish and wildlife habitat for resident species of high interest to the State, and which are essential for maintaining these priority wildlife species, would be considered unsuitable. Examples of such lands that serve a critical function for the species involved include—

- Active dancing and strutting grounds for sage-grouse, sharp-tailed grouse, and prairie chicken
- Winter ranges most critical for deer, antelope, and elk
- Migration corridors for elk.

A lease may be issued if, after consultation with the State, the surface management agency determines that all or certain stipulated methods of coal mining will not have a significant long-term impact on the species being protected.

A large portion of the coal planning area is critical habitat for mule deer, elk, antelope, sage-grouse, and sharp-tailed grouse. Colorado Division of Wildlife (CDOW) provided maps showing these severe winter ranges, concentration areas, migration routes, and production areas, which are essential to the continued

maintenance of these populations. Two townships, T. 8 N., R. 90 and 91 W., are particularly important to mule deer and elk. CDOW has recommended that no more than 10 percent of these townships be leased at one time. Currently, 6,424 acres (or 14 percent) have been leased by the Colorado State Land Board; therefore, no additions for federal leasing should occur, and the remaining 37,960 acres of federal coal lands should be unsuitable.

All remaining adverse impacts on critical habitats for mule deer, elk, antelope, sage-grouse, and sharp-tailed grouse can be mitigated by requiring that the “Wildlife Habitat Replacement Stipulations” (see below) be attached to any future leases.

Wildlife Habitat Replacement Stipulations

The lessee will be required to mitigate for mule deer, elk, antelope, and sage- and sharp-tailed grouse habitat loss, where applicable, and the resultant loss of displacement of these species, as key indicator species, because of surface coal mining operations. Concurrently with the filing of its mine plan, the lessee shall submit for approval to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), a habitat recovery and replacement plan for protection or enhancement of mule deer, elk, antelope, and grouse populations affected by habitat loss or displacement from historical habitat.

The habitat recovery and replacement plan will be developed in consultation with the BLM and CDOW, based on estimates of lost and disturbed habitat as described in the *Green River-Hams Fork Coal Final Environmental Impact Statement*. If the mine plan submitted by the lessee indicates figures different from those used in the environmental impact statement as to quality and quantity of habitat lost or disturbed, mitigative alternatives will be recalculated, based on revised data in the mine plan.

The final habitat recovery and replacement plan will indicate the methods to be employed by the lessee, which will ensure the carrying capacity of the recovered or replaced land has the capacity to support applicable indicator species as agreed upon by BLM and CDOW.

Mitigative methods may require the lessee to employ techniques for wildlife range manipulation or intensive wildlife range management. Habitat recovery might not be completely feasible in the permit area; therefore, recovery or replacement may be accomplished on lands made available through the surface management agency, the State, or the lessee outside the permit area in combination with recovery and replacement methods on suitable lands within the permit area.

The habitat recovery and replacement plan would include the following:

- A habitat analysis of the permit area that—
 - Identifies the above species that occupy the permit area
 - Includes an analysis of the quality carrying capacity of the habitat for those species.
- A detailed description of the methods selected by the lessee to mitigate habitat loss, together with a comparative analysis of alternate methods that were considered and rejected by the lessee, and the rationale for the decision to select the proposed methods. The methods utilized by the lessee for recovery and replacement may include, but are not limited to, the following techniques:
 - Increased quantity and quality of forage available to wildlife
 - Acquisition of critical wildlife habitats
 - Mechanical manipulation of low-quality wildlife to increase its carrying capacity for selected wildlife species
 - Recovery, replacement, or protection of important wildlife habitat by selected fencing.
- A timetable giving the periods of time required to accomplish the habitat recovery or replacement plan and showing how this timetable relates to the overall mining plan.

- An evaluation of the final plan by CDOW. The State shall comment on the methods selected and the techniques to be employed by the lessee, and it may recommend alternate recovery or replacement methods. If the State has recommended an alternate method, the lessee should consider the State's recommendation, and if the lessee rejects the State's plan, the lessee should indicate its reasons as required by provision 2 above. If no State comment is included in the plan, the lessee should verify its consultation with the State, and the plan may be considered without comment.

CRITERION 13—FLOODPLAINS

Federal lands in riverine, coastal, and special floodplains (100-year recurrence interval) on which the surface management agency determines mining could not be undertaken without substantial threat of loss of life or property should be considered unsuitable for all or certain stipulated methods of coal mining.

Results:

The 100-year floodplains and the areas encompassing 100 feet adjacent to each bank of the mainstream channels overlying federal coal between the beginning point and ending point of the lands shown in Table C-1 have been identified as unsuitable.

The areas inundated by the 100-year flood peak stage in and paralleling the mainstream bottoms and the areas 100 feet adjacent to each bank of the mainstream channels within the following lands have been identified as unsuitable:

Lay Creek

T. 8 N., R. 93 W. 6th P.M.
 Sec. 21: Lots 5, 6, 7, 8
 Set 22: N1/2SE1/4SW1/4
 Set 32: Lots 1, 4, 6, 10, 15

The areas inundated by the 100-year flood peak stage in and paralleling the mainstream bottoms and the areas 300 feet adjacent to each bank of the mainstream channels within the following lands have been identified as unsuitable:

Fish Creek

T. 5 N., R. 87 W. 6th P.M.
 Sec. 34: SE1/4
 Sec. 36: NW1/4NW1/4NW1/4

Table C-1. Unsuitable Floodplains

Floodplain	Beginning Point	Ending Point
Yampa	T. 6 N., R. 85 W. sec. 18, NW1/4NW1/4	T. 6 N., R. 94 W. sec. 19, NW1/4NW1/4
Williams Fork	T. 4 N., R. 88 W. sec. 8, SE1/4SE1/4	T. 6 N., R. 91 W. sec. 36, NE1/4NW1/4
Big Gulch	T. 8 N., R. 92 W. sec. 6, NE1/4SE 1/4	T. 7 N., R. 93 W. sec. 22, W1/2

Floodplain	Beginning Point	Ending Point
Lay Creek	T. 7 N., R. 93 W. sec. 5, NW1/4NW1/4 T. 8 N., R. 93 W. sec. 2, NW1/4NW1/4	T. 7 N., R. 95 W. sec. 31, NW1/4NW1/4 T. 8 N., R. 93 W. sec. 21, N1/2SE1/4
Good Springs Creek	T. 3 N., R. 93 W. sec. 33, SW1/4SE1/4	T. 4 N., R. 93 W. sec. 26, NW1/4SE1/4
Milk Creek	T. 3 N., R. 92 W. sec. 29, SE1/4SE1/4	T. 5 N., R. 92 W. sec. 30, NW1/4NE1/4
Stinking Gulch	T. 4 N., R. 92 W. sec. 36, SW1/4SW1/4	T. 4 N., R. 92 W. sec. 26, SW1/4NE1/4
Sand Creek	T. 4 N., R. 89 W. sec. 36, SE1/4NE1/4	T. 4 N., R. 89 W. sec. 23, SW1/4NE1/4
Sand Spring Gulch,	T. 6 N., R. 92 W. sec. 8, SW1/4SW1/4	T. 6 N., R. 93 W. sec. 3, NE1/4SW1/4
North Fork Big Gulch	T. 8 N., R. 92 W. sec. 2, NW1/4NW1/4	T. 8 N., R. 92 W. sec. 21, SW1/4NW1/4
Hart Gulch	T. 4 N., R. 90 W. sec. 17, NE1/4SW1/4	T. 4 N., R. 91 W. sec. 25, NE1/4NE1/4
Waddle Creek	T. 3 N., R. 90 W. sec. 3, SE1/4SW1/4	T. 4 N., R. 90 W. sec. 20, SE1/4SW1/4
Deer Creek	T. 3 N., R. 91 W. sec. 12, SE1/4SE1/4	T. 5 N., R. 91 W. sec. 32, SW1/4NE1/4
Morapos Creek	T. 4 N., R. 91 W. sec. 32, SW1/4SE1/4	T. 5 N., R. 91 W. sec. 20, NW1/4SE1/4
Unnamed Creek	T. 5 N., R. 91 W. sec. 33, SE1/4NE1/4	T. 5 N., R. 91 W. sec. 28, NE1/4SE1/4
Pine Ridge Gulch	T. 7 N., R. 91 W. sec. 19, NE1/4NW1/4	T. 7 N., R. 91 W. sec. 33, SW1/4SE1/4
Cedar Mountain Gulch	T. 7 N., R. 91 W. sec. 9, SW1/4NW1/4	T. 7 N., R. 91 W. sec. 27, SW1/4SE1/4
South Fork Williams Fork	T. 4 N., R. 89 W. sec. 31, SE1/4SW1/4	T. 4 N., R. 89 W. sec. 19, SW1/4NW1/4
Deacon Gulch	T. 6 N., R. 90 W. sec. 33, SE1/4SE1/4	T. 6 N., R. 90 W. sec. 20, NE1/4SE1/4
Elkhead River	T. 8 N., R. 89 W. sec. 3, NE1/4NW1/4	T. 7 N., R. 89 W. sec. 30, SW1/4NE1/4
Berry Gulch	T. 5 N., R. 89 W. sec. 27, NW1/4NE1/4	T. 5 N., R. 89 W. sec. 30, SW1/4SE1/4
Dry Fork Little Bear Creek	T. 8 N., R. 89 W. sec. 2, NW1/4NW1/4	T. 8 N., R. 89 W. sec. 3, SW1/4NE1/4
Wadell Gulch	T. 8 N., R. 89 W. sec. 31, SW1/4SW1/4	T. 8 N., R. 89 W. sec. 33, SE1/4SE1/4
Willow Creek	T. 4 N., R. 88 W. sec. 13, SE1/4SE1/4	T. 4 N., R. 88 W. sec. 20, NW1/4NW1/4

Floodplain	Beginning Point	Ending Point
East Fork Williams Fork	T. 4 N., R. 88 W. sec. 32, SE1/4SW1/4	T. 4 N., R. 88 W. sec. 20, NW1/4NW1/4
Dry Creek	T. 5 N., R. 88 W. sec. 20, NW1/4SE1/4	T. 5 N., R. 88 W. sec. 9, NE1/4SE1/4
Fortification Creek	T. 8 N., R. 90 W. sec. 23, SW1/4NW1/4	T. 7 N., R. 91 W. sec. 25, SE1/4NE1/4
Stokes Gulch	T. 5 N., R. 89 W. sec. 8, NW1/4SE1/4	T. 6 N., R. 89 W. sec. 25, SE1/4NE1/4
Dill Gulch	T. 5 N., R. 89 W. sec. 20, SE1/4NE1/4	T. 6 N., R. 88 W. sec. 31, NE1/4NE1/4
Rock Spring Gulch	T. 7 N., R. 89 W. sec. 24, SW1/4NW1/4	T. 7 N., R. 89 W. sec. 25, SE1/4SE1/4
Buck Gulch	T. 7 N., R. 88 W. sec. 20, SE 1/4NW1/4	T. 7 N., R. 88 W. sec. 27, NW1/4SW1/4
Morgan Creek	T. 7 N., R. 87 W. sec. 34, NW1/4SE1/4	T. 7 N., R. 88 W. sec. 13, NW1/4NE1/4
Meadow Gulch	T. 7 N., R. 87 W. sec. 25, SE1/4SW1/4	T. 6 N., R. 87 W. sec. 3, NE1/4NE1/4
Butchknife Gulch	T. 6 N., R. 87 W. sec. 1, NW1/4NE1/44	T. 6 N., R. 87 W. sec. 12, NW1/4NE1/4
Little Butchknife Gulch	T. 6 N., R. 86 W. sec. 6, SW1/4NE1/4	T. 6 N., R. 86 W. sec. 7, NW1/4SW1/4
McCrosky Gulch	T. 6 N., R. 86 W. sec. 4, SE1/4NW 1/4	T. 6 N., R. 86 W. sec. 9, NE1/4SE1/4
Fish Creek	T. 4 N., R. 87 W. sec. 34, SE1/4SW1/4 T. 5 N., R. 86 W. sec. 20, SW1/4NW1/4	T. 5 N., R; 86 W. sec. 1, NW1/4NE1/4 T. 5 N., R. 87 W. sec. 34, SW1/4SE1/4

CRITERION 14—MUNICIPAL WATERSHEDS

Federal lands that have been committed by the surface management agency for use as municipal watersheds would be considered unsuitable.

Exception:

A lease may be issued where the surface management agency, in consultation with the municipality (incorporated entity) or the responsible governmental unit, determines, as a result of studies, that all or certain stipulated methods of coal mining will not adversely affect the watershed to any significant degree.

Result:

No lands have been committed by the surface management agency to be used as municipal watersheds within the planning area.

CRITERION 15—NATIONAL RESOURCE WATERS

Federal lands with National Resource Waters, as identified by States in their water quality management plans, and a buffer zone of federal lands one-fourth of a mile from the outer edge of the far banks of the water would be unsuitable.

Exception:

The buffer zone may be eliminated or reduced in size when the surface management agency determines it is not necessary to protect the National Resource Waters.

Results:

There are no such lands within the planning area.

CRITERION 16—ALLUVIAL VALLEY FLOORS

Federal lands identified by the surface management agency, in consultation with the State in which they are located, as alluvial valley floors according to the definition in 3400.0-5(a) of this title, the standards in 30 CFR Part 822, the final alluvial valley floor guidelines of the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement when published, and approved State programs under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, where mining would interrupt, discontinue, or preclude farming would be considered unsuitable. In addition, when mining federal land outside an alluvial valley floor would materially damage the quantity or quality of water in surface or underground water systems that would supply alluvial valley floors, the land would be considered unsuitable.

Results:

Table C-2 describes the estimated elevations and locations of alluvial valley floors, which have been assessed as unsuitable.

The areas in and paralleling the mainstream bottoms and the areas encompassing 300 feet adjacent to each bank of the mainstream channels within the following lands are also unsuitable:

Fish Creek

T. 5 N., R. 87 W., 6th P.M.
Sec. 34: SE1/4
Sec. 36: NW/14NW1/4NW1/4

Flume Gulch

T. 6 N., R. 90 W., 6th P.M.
Sec. 19: E1/2
Sec. 20: SW1/4

Sec. 29

Foidel Creek

T. 5 N., R. 86 W., 6th P.M.

Sec. 21: SE1/4

Sec. 28: E1/2NW1/4

Wilson Creek

T. 3 N., R. 93 W., 6th P.M.

Sec. 7: SW1/4

T. 4 N., R 93 W., 6th P.M.

Sec. 21

Sec. 22

Sec. 28

Sec. 33: SW1/4NW1/4

Table C-2. Locations and Estimated Elevations of Alluvial Valley Floors

Locations	Contour Line (feet)
ELKHEAD RIVER	
T. 7 N., R. 89 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 25, 29, 30	6,280
Sec. 20, 21	6,320
Sec. 20	6,360
Sec. 2, 3	6,400
Sec. 1, 12	6,400
T. 7N., R 88 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 5, 6, 7	6,440
Sec. 14	6,760
T. 8 N., R 88 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 32	6,480
Sec. 29	6,520
Sec. 28, 21	6,560
Sec. 16	6,620
Sec. 17, 18	6,680
Sec. 7, 8	6,760
FORTIFICATION CREEK	
T. 7 N., R 90 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 19, 30	6,240
Sec. 20	6,260
Sec. 17, 21	6,270
Sec. 3, 9, 10	6,320

Locations	Contour Line (feet)
FISH CREEK	
T. 6N., R 86 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 36	6,600
T. 5 N., R.86 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 1, 2	6,600
Sec. 3, 10, 11	6,640
Sec. 15, 16	6,680
Sec. 17, 19, 20	6,720
T. 4 N., R. 87 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 11	6,920
Sec. 10	7,000
T. 5 N., R. 85 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 6	6,640
Sec. 7	6,720
Sec. 19	6,840
Sec. 30	6,920
T. 5 N., R. 86 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 1	6,600
T. 6 N., R. 86 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 24, 25	6,560
T. 4 N., R. 86 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 12	7,080
Sec. 14	7,240
Sec. 23	7,320
Sec. 22	7,400
Sec. 27	7,440
Sec. 28	7,520
Sec. 33	7,580
GOOD SPRING CREEK	
T. 4 N., R. 93 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 26	6,440
Sec. 35	6,520
T. 3 N., R, 93 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 11	6,680
Sec. 14	6,760
WILLIAMS FORK RIVER	
T. 5 N., R. 91 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 6	6,160
Sec. 7, 8, 17, 20	6,240
Sec. 21, 22, 23, 26, 27	6,380
Sec. 24	6,320

Locations	Contour Line (feet)
T. 5 N., R. 90 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 26, 27	6,440
YAMPA RIVER	
T. 6 N., R. 94 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 15, 17, 18, 23, 27, 36	6,000
T. 6 N., R. 93 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 21, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34	6,040
Sec. 35	6,160
T. 5 N., R. 93 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 2	6,160
Sec. 1	6,120
T. 6 N., R. 92 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 31	6,120
Sec. 36	6,160
T. 5 N., R. 92 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec.1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	6,120
T. 6 N., R. 91 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 3, 9, 10, 11, 17, 18, 30	6,200
T. 7 N., R. 89 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 31, 32	6,320
T. 6 N., R. 89 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 10	6,320
T. 6 N., R. 87 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14	6,440
T. 6 N., R. 86 W., 6th P.M.	
Sec. 7, 8, 9	6,480
Sec. 10, 11	6,520
Sec. 12, 13	6,560

Table C-3. Summary of Unsuitability Results, Alternatives B and C

Criterion	Acres Before Exceptions	Acres After Exceptions
1. Federal Lands Systems	940	940
2. ROWs and Easements	4,753	0
3. Buffer Zones Along ROWs and Adjacent to Communities and Buildings	4,925	4,925
4. Wilderness Study Areas	0	0
5. Scenic Areas	0	0
6. Lands Used for Scientific Studies	0	0
7. Historic Lands and Sites	0	0
8. Natural Areas	0	0

Criterion	Acres Before Exceptions	Acres After Exceptions
9. Federally Listed Endangered Species	11,626	11,626
10. State-Listed Endangered Species	0	0
11. Raptors	24,647	24,647
12. State Resident Fish and Wildlife	394,559	0
13. Floodplains	5,104	5,104
14. Municipal Watersheds	0	0
15. National Resource Waters	0	0
16. Alluvial Valley Floors	1,948	1,948
Total Unsuitable Acres	448,502	49,190